


For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/Stewart1971>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE IN THE
ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS:
THE CASE OF THE ALBERTA UNIVERSITIES

by



WILLIAM ALEXANDER STEWART

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1971

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the relationship between incumbency in various positions within and related to an organization and perceptions and preferences incumbents have regarding organizational goals.

Random samples of students, faculty members, and administrators from the three Alberta universities, all members of the three Boards of Governors, and all Members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta were asked to indicate the current emphasis placed on a list of university goals ('perceived' goals) and what importance they believe ought to be placed on each goal ('preferred' goals). Means, rank order correlations, and contingency tables were utilized to assess the convergence and divergence in goal assessment in each group and among the groups.

In general, the groups (particularly students, faculty members, and administrators) are not found to differ as greatly as expected. However, clear differences do exist in some goal perceptions and preferences. Students express the greatest divergence between the current and desired priorities, while administrators express the greatest convergence. Little support is offered for utilization of the 'professional organization model' in the study of universities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my three thesis committee members for their valuable suggestions, their constructive criticism, and their patience. I would also like to thank Mrs. Donna Quinton for the very valuable assistance which she offered and gave so generously.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Footnotes	4
CHAPTER	
I BACKGROUND LITERATURE	5
Universities as Organizations	5
Universities as Professional Organizations	5
The Definitions of Organizational Goals	8
The Functions of Organizational Goals	13
Footnotes	16
II QUESTIONS and PROCEDURES	18
The Questions	18
The Population & Sample	20
The Questionnaire	21
Initial Data Analysis	23
Footnotes	25
III ANALYSIS, RESULTS, and DISCUSSIONS.	26
The Respondents	26
1. Which Groups Value Certain Types of Goals?	27
2. What are the Different Goals Each Group Values .	32
3. How Much Divergence or Consensus is There	
Regarding Each of These Goals?	34
4. What Degree of Consensus is There Between Goal	
Perceptions?	41
5. What is the Relationship Between Goal Perceptions	
and Goal Preferences?	42
Summary and Discussion	47
IV CONCLUSIONS and IMPLICATIONS.	50
Conclusions	50
Implications	52
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	53
APPENDIX	55

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Percentage of Questionnaires Signed by Respondents.....	23
2. Questionnaire Response Rates of Major Groups.....	23
3. Age, Sex and Education of Respondents.....	26
4. Goal Categories by Major Groups.....	27
5. Group Preferences in Individual Goals.....	33
6. Similarity in Preferred Goals.....	36
7. Differences in Preferred Goals.....	37
8. Divergence in Emphasized Goals.....	39
9. Student Preference Correlations by Faculty	40
10. Student Preference Correlations by Year.....	41
11. Similarities in Goal Perceptions.....	42
12. Perceived - Preferred Goal Correlations.....	43
13. Perceived - Preferred Goal Divergence.....	45

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The area of sociological investigation upon which this study focuses is that of organizational theory. It is concerned with utilization of organizational theory in an examination of varying perceptions and preferences of organizational goals. More specifically, an attempt is made to determine the similarities and differences in the goal perceptions and preferences of people in positions which may have an impact on their organization's goals.

The organization selected for this study is the university, as represented by the three Alberta universities. While it is a partial replication of a landmark study in the area¹, it differs significantly in some respects.

The most notable weakness in the study by Gross and Grambsch is its implicit assumption that the only groups which have a significant impact on the goals of universities are their faculty members and academic administrators. This ignores the growing reality of the student presence in the development of goals. If it could be assumed that students view the goals of universities in the same way as academics, it could be argued that the inclusion of students is unnecessary. However, available literature suggests that students are likely to have significantly different goal preferences from other members of the university.² Since student goal preferences may differ, and since students are playing an increasingly important role in university governance, they are included in this study.

Perhaps because they were studying privately-supported as well as publicly-supported universities, Gross and Grambsch also ignored the reality of the 'public' component in the determination of university goals. The universities in Alberta have been the recipients of a rapidly growing proportion of the Provincial budget (approximately 10% in 1970). Concern over this fact has been expressed by members of the Legislature (particularly the Minister of Education), and it is be-

coming clear that public funds will not be as readily available as they have been. Closer scrutiny of university budgets by members of both Boards of Governors and the Alberta Legislature will, at least indirectly, increase the involvement of both bodies in determination of the goals of the universities. For these reasons, members of the Boards of Governors of the three Alberta universities and members of the Legislature of the Province of Alberta were included in the study.

In addition to the 'errors' suggested above, other reasons exist for repeating the Gross-Grامbsch study in Canada. The social structures in the United States and in Canada face different 'crucial' problems. Americans have generally spent a considerable portion of the past decade debating such issues as race relations and American involvement in the Far East, while in Canada issues of this nature have not been as viable. The effect seems to have been that universities in Canada have been more introspective, with one result being that students appear to have gained a greater degree of involvement in the governance of Canadian than American universities. In some ways, this study may shed light on the applicability of American studies of universities for Canadians.

Another reason for repeating the Gross-Grامbsch study in Canada is that the nature of Canadian universities differs significantly from American universities. Porter suggests that:

Canada's universities, which bear many superficial resemblances in their pedagogical and organizational structures to those of the United States, have been very much behind in the process of democratization as judged by such criteria as the proportion of the age-group attending university, the removal of financial barriers to higher education, the secularisation of control, and a shift from the high evaluation of humanistic studies to the more instrumental and popular subjects such as engineering and science, the social sciences and business and public administration.³

If Porter's perceptions are accurate, the different composition

of the universities may produce significantly different goal priorities within various positions.

At a time when fiscal pressures are increasing⁴, the universities need to clarify their priorities and, therefore, their goals. There is some question as to the relative importance which members of the university community place on 'teaching-learning' and 'research'. When the goals are broadened beyond these two concepts, as they are in this study, an even greater lack of consensus may exist. There are currently no data available with which to assess this question, so this study may make a positive contribution to persons in and around Alberta universities who wish to clarify university goals.

This thesis, then, is a study of the relationships between incumbency in various positions within and related to an organization and the perceptions and preferences incumbents have regarding organizational goals.

FOOTNOTES

¹Edward Gross and Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968 .

²Frederick M. Jervis and Robert G. Congdon, "Student and Faculty Perceptions of Educational Values", American Psychologist, Vol. 13, 1958, pp. 464-466 .

³John Porter, "The Democratisation of the Canadian Universities and the Need for a National System", Minerva, February, 1970, p. 326 .

⁴Ibid., p. 325 .

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND LITERATURE

Universities as Organizations

In a paper stemming in part from the Gross-Grambsch study¹, Gross points out that many studies of universities have viewed them either as institutions "...concerned with performing something essential for the society, such as upward mobility and the like...", or as communities "...providing 'homes' or 'atmospheres' in which persons may set their own goals, such as self-fulfillment, the pursuit of truth ...and other traditional ivory-tower values...".² He argues that greater understanding of the university may be reached if it is also studied as an organization, since the concepts of institution and community do not lay sufficient stress on the importance to the university of goal attainment.

While all social systems have goals of some sort or other, the primacy of goal attainment in organizations, and hence their distinguishing feature, is such that effectiveness is judged in terms of ability to approximate their goals.³ The now-famous statement of Clark Kerr regarding the uses of the modern university underlines the importance of goals in the functioning of universities. The contemporary university scene, wherein many campuses are finding members arguing for such things as the increased 'relevance' of the university to societal problems, provides additional support for examining the university as an organization.

Universities as Professional Organizations

While Gross and Grambsch have clearly shown the value of studying universities as organizations, it is posited herein that their analysis was limited because they did not take sufficient cognizance of the special nature of the organization they were studying. In a bureaucracy, there is a hierarchy which derives its legitimacy from

the assumed superiority in organizational decision-making which personnel in the higher echelons of the organization have over personnel 'under' them (often including professionals). In what are normally considered to be the 'support and maintenance' activities of the university, this 'line' structure operates as successfully as in most organizations. However, the variable of 'professionalism' is introduced relative to the 'output' goals of the university, and it produces a structural change which makes it seem likely that it would be fruitful to study universities as professional organizations.

Professional organizations are characterized by the goals they pursue (the production, application, preservation, or communication of knowledge), the high proportion of professionals in their staff, and an authority relationship between professionals and non-professionals wherein the professionals "...have superior authority over the major goal activities of the organization...".⁴ While application of these criteria to universities may validate studying them as professional organizations, there are some discrepancies between the model and reality.

The authority relationship between professionals and non-professionals is problematic and of concern to this study. Etzioni refers to this relationship as it pertains to "major goal activities" (that is, the carrying out of the major goals of the organization), and at the activities stage it seems to be valid. However, the relationship is not so clear in the rather vague process by which universities determine their major goals (given the definition of goals posited in the next section). This is important, since it is possible (and preferable) to view organizational goal-setting "...not as a static element but as a necessary and recurring problem facing any organization...".⁵ As was suggested earlier, there are at least five groups within and related to Alberta universities which are concerned with university goals and the emphasis these goals are to receive. It seems likely that professionals will be allowed to

set their own goals as well as "...have superior authority over the major goal activities..." only when the people they serve are either sufficiently ignorant of or satisfied with what these goals are and how they should be achieved. There are now signs that various groups are increasingly unwilling to allow teaching-faculty members to set major goals without reference to the groups. Whether this is an accurate statement or not, there is no clear and generally accepted definition by these groups (including the university faculties) of what the goals and goal-priorities are and should be. The present determination of goals and priorities takes place in a vacuum, if it takes place, in any formalized sense, at all.

Blau and Scott, in pointing out basic differences between bureaucratic organizations and professional organizations, suggest that "...the professional is bound by a norm of service and a code of ethics to represent the welfare and interests of his clients, whereas the bureaucrats' foremost responsibility is to represent and promote the interests of his organization...".⁶ The question is who is to define the 'welfare and interests' of clients of the university. Professors, as professionals, may wish to be responsible for this definition, as they often have been in the past. Again, however, it is argued that other groups seem to be increasingly unwilling to allow them to make this decision without at least prior consultation with them and at most ratification by them.

An application of the professional organization model to the publicly-supported universities in Alberta, for example, could assign roles in the following way: students are the clients; professors are the professionals; and academic administrators, members of Boards of Governors, and members of the Alberta Legislature form a hierarchy concerned with supporting and maintaining the effective functioning of the professors. It must be recognized that this application holds some sources of role strain which may affect the results of this study. While members of the Legislature do make decisions of a

'management' nature, they are representatives of the citizens of the Province. Since, in a broad sense, Albertans are clients of the universities they support, their representatives also play this role. Academic administrators experience role strain. On one hand, they are expected to manage the affairs of the university in the 'public' interest. On the other hand, professors expect administrators with a 'professional' background to manage the affairs of the university in the 'professional' interest. Students have gradually increased the scope of their role in developing policy for universities, so that simply depicting them as clients in the usual sense of that term has some new tensions about which the researcher must be aware.

These deviations from the model may produce competing or conflicting expectations regarding the function of various groups within the institution, with resultant organizational stress. When the goals and their importance are not clear, the possibility of this sort of stress occurring is magnified. In its attempt to assess the applicability of the professional organization model to the university, it is hoped that the study will contribute to the clarification of these matters for groups which are a part of the university, broadly defined.

The Definition of Organizational Goals

With the concept of 'goals' so basic to the study of organizations, it would seem reasonable to expect that a precise, generally accepted definition would be readily accessible. However, as Gross points out⁷, little time appears to have been spent in the development of such a definition. Those definitions which do exist alternately seem to emphasize, de-emphasize or ignore such variables as who defines the goals, whether goals are personal or organizational, and which outputs of an organization measure the goals of that organization.

The most pervasive viewpoint in the literature involves the attempt to define the 'actual' goals of an organization. Some writers do this in terms of the output of the organization (subsystem) to a

larger group (system).⁸ Some do it in terms of the stated intention of the organization. For example, an organizational goal is "...a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize...".⁹

The goals of organizations, in Gross' view, are considerably broader than their outputs. As he points out, Bales has shown that while groups initially devote all of their attention to moving toward their specified goal, they eventually find it necessary to utilize some effort in order to repair interpersonal damage produced by the group's attempt to reach this goal. It is paradoxical that "...an organization must do more than give attention to goal attainment in order to attain its goals."¹⁰ When these 'support', system-maintaining activities are examined, it may be seen that the various units of an organization responsible for them may tend to exaggerate the importance of their contribution to the extent that they perceive the whole organization in terms of their particular efforts.

There is only one way that one can be sure the persons will do a job as well as it can possibly be done and that is to insist that they make ends of such 'means' activities. When a means has been made into an end it has then become a goal of the organization.

What we are suggesting then is that there are at least two different kinds of goals in organizations, those goals which are reflected in an output of some kind which we will call "output goals", and those goals which are the ends of those who are charged with responsibility for the maintenance activities, which we will call 'support goals'.¹¹

On the basis of this argument, and on the basis of consultation with university professors and administrators, Gross and Grambsch developed a list of goals and goal definitions which will be used in this study. The list, which is used on the questionnaire, is not meant to be comprehensive, but simply representative of each category. The categories, their definitions, and the goals included in each category are listed below. (The numbers of the goals are used when

the goals are referred to in tables throughout the study.)

O U T P U T G O A L S

Output goals are those goals of the university which, immediately or in the future, are reflected in some product, service, skill, or orientation which will affect (and is intended to affect) society.

Student-Expressive goals involve the attempt to change the student's identity or character in some fundamental way.

1. Produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.
2. Produce a well-rounded student, that is, one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual, and esthetic potentialities have all been cultivated.
3. Make sure the student is permanently affected (in mind and spirit) by the great ideas of the great minds of history.
4. Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.
5. Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.

Student-Instrumental goals involve the student's being equipped to do something specific for the society which he will be entering or to operate in a specific way in that society.

6. Prepare students specifically for useful careers.
7. Provide the student with skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which maximize the likelihood of his occupying a high status in life and a position of leadership in society.
8. Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor.
9. Make a good consumer of the student-- a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices.
10. Produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively.

Research goals involve the production of new knowledge or the solution of problems.

11. Carry on pure research.
12. Carry on applied research.

Direct Service goals involve the direct and continuing provision of services to the population outside the university (that is, not faculty, full-time students, or staff). These services are provided because the university, as an organization, is better equipped than any other organization to provide them.

13. Provide special training for part-time adult students, through extension courses, special short courses, correspondence courses, etc.
14. Assist citizens directly through extension programs, advice, consultation, and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services other than teaching.
15. Provide cultural leadership for the community through university-sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, athletic events, and other performances, displays, or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not.
16. Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics.
17. Serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage.

S U P P O R T G O A L S

Adaptation goals reflect the need for the university as an organization to come to terms with the environment in which it is located: to attract students and staff, to finance the enterprise, to secure needed resources, and to validate the activities of the university with those persons or agencies in a position to affect them.

18. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.
19. Ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer (validating groups include accrediting bodies, professional societies, scholarly peers at other universities, and respected persons in intellectual or artistic circles).
20. Educate to his utmost capacities every high school graduate who meets basic legal requirements for admission.
21. Accommodate only students of high potential in terms of the specific strengths and emphases of this university.
22. Orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region.

23. Keep costs down as low as possible, through more efficient utilization of time and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.
24. Hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other universities.

Management goals involve decisions on who should run the university, the need to handle conflict, and the establishment of priorities as to which output goals should be given maximum attention.

25. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to his own profession or discipline.
26. Involve faculty in the government of the university.
27. Involve students in the government of the university.
28. Make sure the university is run democratically insofar as that is feasible.
29. Keep harmony between departments or divisions of the university when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters.
30. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this university.
31. Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.
32. Encourage students to go into graduate work.
33. Make sure the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible.
34. Make sure that on all important issues (not only curriculum), the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail.

Motivation goals seek to ensure a high level of satisfaction on the part of staff and students and emphasize loyalty to the university as a whole.

35. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.
36. Make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria.
37. Provide a full round of student activities.
38. Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in.
39. Protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind and any

attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals.

40. Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns.
41. Develop greater pride on the part of faculty, staff, and students in their university and the things it stands for.

Position goals help to maintain the position of the university in terms of the kind of place it is compared with other universities and in the face of trends which could change its position.

42. Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in.
43. Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).
44. Maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in.
45. Keep up to date and responsive.
46. Increase the prestige of the university or, if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure the maintenance of that prestige.
47. Keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and point of view, its "character."

There are two ways of viewing goals which are of importance to this study. The goals of the organization, as perceived by individuals and groups within the organization, may differ markedly from what an observer would define the 'actual' goals to be.¹³ However, what is important to each member is his perception of the organization's goals ('perceived' goals). The second important viewpoint involves goals 'as they should be', from the point of view of members ('preferred' goals). This study's measurement of goals will fulfill two objectives: it will make possible an evaluation of relationships which exist between position incumbency and goal perceptions and preferences; and it will point out some differences between perceptions and preferences for respondents.

The Functions of Organizational Goals

One of the problems which must be faced in studying some

organizations, such as universities, is that their goals are intangible (that is, "...expressions of intended states of affairs that do not adequately describe the desired states or activities that would constitute their achievement...").¹⁴ While it may be argued that broad, intangible goals enable the organization to accommodate the goals of a wide variety of groups, sub-groups and individuals, the expectations which may arise relative to the organization actually accomplishing these goals, if unfulfilled, may give rise to dissatisfaction.¹⁵ Further, "...frustration, anxiety, and role conflict..." may result.¹⁶ If intangible goals provide inadequate guidance for organizational action (which appears to be the case on many university campuses), they will tend to be displaced by tangible goals.¹⁷

The university could make its goals more tangible to its members by making them more definite than the 'acquisition, application, and transmission of knowledge'. This would increase the likelihood that the university would realize the benefits of clear organizational goals, such as orientation through:

...depicting a future state of affairs which the organization strives to realize. Thus they (goals) set down guidelines for organizational activity. Goals also constitute a source of legitimacy which justifies the activities of an organization and, indeed, its very existence. Moreover, goals serve as standards by which members of an organization and outsiders can assess the success of the organization - i.e., its effectiveness and efficiency.¹⁸

Other functions have been proposed. A goal accepted by most, if not all, members suggests "...a readiness to accept influence attempts from other members, since they all see that they are promoting each others ends...".¹⁹ Clearly established goals also permit the greatest decentralization of decision-making.²⁰ On the other hand, when goals are absent or minimal, groups with mutually exclusive goals will develop.

While a clear guiding purpose may seem basic to the effective administration of an organization, a university "...concerned with

the universality of knowledge and dedicated to the encouragement of inquiry wherever it may lead exists in an environment in which the precise definition of purpose is impossible...".²¹ Groups and individuals within the university are given, or take, substantial freedom in determining their purpose. This is not to say, however, that the exercise of attempting to define its own goals would be of little value to a university. At least, such an effort should enable it to define its goals more specifically than as the 'acquisition, application, and transmission of knowledge'. It should make it possible to determine some priorities in a goal system, and it could enable members to understand and accept or attempt to reduce disparities between their 'perceived' and 'preferred' goals.

FOOTNOTES

¹Edward Gross, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach", American Sociological Review, 33: 518-44, August, 1968.

²Ibid., p. 518.

³Talcott Parsons, Theories of Society, Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1961, pp. 38-41.

⁴Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey, 1964, p. 78.

⁵James D. Thompson and William J. McEwan, "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal-Setting as an Interaction Process", American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, No 1., February, 1958.

⁶Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, "Dilemmas of Formal Organizations", in Etzioni, Amitai, (ed.), Readings on Modern Organizations, Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey, 1969, p. 140.

⁷Gross, op. cit., p. 519.

⁸Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1960.

⁹Etzioni, op. cit., p.6.

¹⁰Edward Gross, "The Definition of Organizational Goals", British Journal of Sociology, 20:3, September, 1968, p. 282.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 283-284.

¹²Edward Gross and Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968, pp. 13-16.

¹³Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966, p. 15.

¹⁴Keith W. Warner And A. Eugene Havens, "Goal Displacement and the Intangibility of Organizational Goals", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12, 1967-1968, p. 540.

¹⁵Edward O. Moe, "Utah Community Development Program", in Warner, W. Keith and A. Eugene Havens. "Goal Displacement and the Intangibility of Organizational Goals", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12, 1967-1968, p. 540.

¹⁶Warner and Havens, op. cit., p. 544.

¹⁷Warner and Havens, op. cit., p. 540.

¹⁸Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey, 1964, p. 5.

¹⁹Morton Deutsch, "The Effects of Cooperation and Competition Upon Group Processes", in Buckley, Walter. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1967, p. 188.

²⁰Keith Davis, Human Relations at Work, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1962, p. 63.

²¹John J. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1960, p. 123.

CHAPTER II

QUESTIONS AND PROCEDURES

The Questions

One of the difficulties faced by Gross and Grambsch was the lack of literature to which they could turn for theoretical support for their expectation that the goal preferences of faculty members and administrators would differ significantly. While this difficulty has not been entirely overcome in this study, it is argued that a step has been taken in that direction by examining universities as professional organizations rather than simply as organizations. This has made it possible to make a clearer definition of, and distinction between, various positions within and related to the organization under study, but it has not made it possible to argue on theoretical grounds that the goal perceptions and preferences of incumbents of these positions will vary in predictable directions.

The problem, then, is that positions have prescriptions and expectations (that is, norms) applied to them, but little has been said in the literature about the expectations of people holding positions, particularly as these expectations relate to the goals of organizations within which the positions are held. As Gross and Grambsch have done for faculty members and administrators, therefore, this study will simply attempt to determine whether or not there are fundamental differences in goal perceptions and preferences between the university's clients (students), professionals (teaching faculty members), and administrators (university administrators, members of Boards of Governors, and members of the Alberta Legislature.)

There are some statements in the literature which would lead to the expectation that there will be differences in goal preferences. Etzioni has suggested that academicians who are willing to accept administrative roles are often less committed to professional values than their colleagues.¹ It may be, then, that the 'academic administrators' under study will generally value output goals less than teaching faculty.

Etzioni implicitly introduces the pressure which may be brought to bear on the 'major' goals of the university by administrators, students, and governing bodies. He points out that, in some institutions, the fear is that the "legitimate" function will be neglected and emphasis put on means, while in universities, a secondary goal (in his mind) threatens to become the major goal.

Although there is some controversy over what constitute the primary and the secondary goals of outstanding universities, it seems fair to conclude that a majority of the members of their professional staff would see research as primary and teaching as secondary. This is well reflected in the prestige and promotion system. But there is constant danger that the university will respond to pressures to give more money and attention to teaching and less to research.²

If Etzioni's perceptions are accurate, professors will display a greater preference for research and related goals than the members of any of the other positions.

Duster argues that the stereotype of administrators is a reality in universities.

Just as the organization of rewards for the faculty produces for them a dominant interest in publishing, so there is a dominant reference point of rewards for administration. In a bureaucracy, the most certain path to promotion and organizational success is compliance with the order of one's line superior. ...The structure of authority makes the administrator responsible to those at the top who make decisions. Those decisions reflect the view that the university ought to be run in an efficient, productive, low-cost, well-organized and moral manner.³

While an analysis of preferences relative to goals in the usual sense (that is, 'output' goals) might not uncover any significant divergence between administrators and professors, it may well be that the broad definition of goals used in this study will show that administrators and faculty members do differ in their preferences.

Duster goes on to discuss differences between students, on the one hand, and faculty members and administrators on the other. He suggests that the faculty and the administration are much more committed to the university "...as an established institution. It is for them much more of an end and a way of life. For the student, it is more of a means...". The student interest may best be described as "...the right to present their interests, whatever they may be."⁴ If this is so, it may be expected that students will give lower priority to output goals than faculty and administration and higher priority to some support goals.

In examining the university as a professional organization, there appear to be five salient groups:

1. students;
2. faculty members;
3. administrators;
4. members of Boards of Governors; and
5. members of the Legislative Assembly.

The questions to be answered by this study are:

1. Which groups value certain types of goals?
2. What are the different goals each group values?
3. How much divergence or consensus is there regarding each of these goals?
4. What degree of consensus is there between goal perceptions?
5. What is the relationship between goal perceptions and goal preferences?⁵

While insufficient evidence or theoretical argument is available to posit hypotheses relative to these questions, this study will attempt to answer them for the organization under study. Clear results will allow for the generation of empirical hypotheses in future studies.

The Population and Sample

The population chosen for this study includes all full-time

teaching faculty members, the academic administrators (Department Heads, Directors of Schools, and Deans), the administrators (Presidents, Vice-Presidents, and Registrars), the full-time students and the members of the Boards of Governors at the University of Alberta, The University of Calgary, and the University of Lethbridge, as well as the members of the Alberta Legislature. It may be noted here that the distinction between 'academic administrators' and 'administrators' is based on their background and their proximity to the teaching faculty members (professionals) within the university. While a study with a broader base for its population would allow for analytical distinctions between these two types of administrators, it has been impossible to do so in this study. However, the distinction is maintained for response to the questionnaire, in order that a subjective analysis of differences or similarities may offer fruitful leads for future inquiry.

The sample consists of:

1. a random sample of 40 per cent of the faculty at each university (550 at the University of Alberta, 275 at The University of Calgary, and 51 at the University of Lethbridge);
2. a random sample of 5 per cent of the students at each university (918 at the University of Alberta, 465 at The University of Calgary, and 71 at the University of Lethbridge); and
3. 100 per cent of the members of the three Boards of Governors (44), the members of the Alberta Legislature (63) and the administrators of each university (102 at the University of Alberta, 40 at The University of Calgary, and 21 at the University of Lethbridge).

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in the study (Appendix), lists forty-

seven goals of a university, as defined by Gross and Grambsch.⁶ Respondents were asked to indicate how important they feel each goal is at their university ('perceived' goals), and how important they feel it should be ('preferred' goals). They used a five-point scale, ranging from 5 ('absolutely top importance') down to 1 ('no importance'). They were asked to briefly examine the whole list of goals prior to responding.

Both as a result of design and necessity, the potential respondents selected in the sample were contacted in a number of different ways. Each of them received a letter explaining the general nature of the study and asking for their support. The students, faculty members, administrators, and members of the Boards of Governors at The University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge each received a letter of support for the project from the President of their university. At the University of Alberta, the letter of support went to the students from the Vice-President (Academic) of the Students' Union, to the faculty members from the President of the Faculty Association, and to the Administrators and members of the Board of Governors from the President of the University. The Members of the Legislative Assembly received their questionnaires from the Minister of Education.

The faculty members, administrators, members of Boards of Governors, and M.L.A.'s were mailed their questionnaires with their introductory and supporting letters. While the confidentiality of the response and the anonymity of the respondent was assured, it was suggested that they might sign the cover page of the questionnaire in order to reduce the expense of the follow-up procedure. Table 1 shows the percentage of each group which chose to do so. Members of the sample who did not either sign the questionnaire or return it within two weeks were mailed a follow-up letter emphasizing the importance of their response.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF QUESTIONNAIRES SIGNED BY RESPONDENTS

	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS .	BOARDS	M.L.A.'s
% Signed	67.3	59.4	47.7	59.3	30.0

The letter which the students received asked them to telephone an office at their university and make an appointment to come to that office to complete a questionnaire (that is, they did not receive the questionnaire in the mail). One five-day week was set aside on each campus for the purpose of holding these appointments. Students who had not arranged an appointment by the Friday prior to these weeks were contacted by telephone. If a student made an appointment and then did not keep it, he received a telephone call asking him to make another appointment during the week.

The major advantage of the appointment system was that it made it possible to keep track of and follow-up the students who had not completed the questionnaire as the week progressed.

Table 2 shows the response rates for the groups involved, with the actual number of responses shown in parentheses.⁷

TABLE 2

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATES OF MAJOR GROUPS

	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS .	BOARDS	M.L.A.'s
U of Alberta	74.18%(681)	48.00%(264)	62.75%(64)	66.67%(10)	
U of Calgary	80.86%(376)	55.27%(152)	77.50%(31)	46.67%(7)	
U of Leth.	81.70%(58)	78.43%(40)	66.67%(14)	71.43%(10)	
ALL	76.68%(1115)	54.34%(456)	66.86%(109)	61.36%(27)	15.87%(10)

Initial Data Analysis

As responses to the pre-coded questionnaire were received, they were key-punched for computer-assisted analysis. The mean perceived

and preferred scores were then calculated on each goal for each group and sub-group. These mean scores formed the basis of the various analyses carried out in Chapter III.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1964, p. 84.

² Ibid, p. 85.

³ Troy Duster, "Student Interests, Student Power, and Swedish Experience", The American Behavioral Scientist, May-June, 1968, p.22.

⁴ Ibid, p. 23.

⁵ The first three questions in this list were drawn from an article sharply critical of the analyses of Gross. See Thiessen, Victor and Mark Iutovich, "Some Comments on Edward Gross's Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach", The American Sociologist, Vol 5, No. 3, August, 1970, p. 253.

⁶ Edward Gross and Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968. pp. 13-16.

⁷ By far the poorest response rate to the questionnaire was 'achieved' by the Members of the Legislative Assembly. As a result, little claim may be made regarding the representativeness of the responses which were received.

Perusal of the nature of the respondents in other groups and recognition of the generally high response rates suggests that no consistent bias exists.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS, RESULTS, and DISCUSSION

The Respondents

The initial analysis involved an assessment of the representativeness of the sample. As indicated in Chapter II, the response rate for all groups other than Members of the Legislative Assembly was satisfactory. Eighty-eight point four per cent of the student respondents were undergraduates, while 11.6% were graduate students. Nine point nine per cent of the faculty members were Sessional Instructors or Post-Doctoral Fellows, 37.1% were Assistant Professors, 33.3% were Associate Professors, and 19.6% were Professors. Seventy point six per cent of the administrators were Department Heads, 19.3% were Deans or Directors, and 10.1% were Presidents, Vice-Presidents, or Registrars. The Faculty or School affiliations of the students, faculty members, and administrators appeared to bear a close relationship to the population. Table 3 displays the average age, male/female percentages, and the modal education for the five groups under study.

TABLE 3

AGE, SEX AND EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

	AVERAGE AGE	MALE/FEMALE	MODAL EDUCATION
STUDENTS	22.4	59.4/40.6	Some University
FACULTY	39.2	87.2/12.8	PH.D.
ADMINISTRATORS	46.1	94.4/5.6	PH.D.
BOARDS	45.6	88.9/11.1	Bachelor's Degree
M.L.A.'s	53.0	100/0.00	Some University

Prior to carrying out further analyses, two computations were necessary. The mean perceived and preferred scores were calculated on each goal for each group and sub-group. The mean

perceived and preferred scores for all goals combined were then calculated for each group. The results were required in order to be able to answer the following five questions.

1. Which groups value certain types of goals?

The mean preferred scores for the two major categories (Output and Support goals) and for the sub-categories (Student-Expressive, Student-Instrumental, Research, Direct Service, Adaptation, Management, Motivation and Position goals) were derived for each group. A goal category or sub-category is taken as valued by a group if its preferred mean is greater than the mean preferred score on all goals for that group. The rank order of the goal sub-categories valued by each group is indicated in Table 4.

TABLE 4
GOAL CATEGORIES PREFERRED BY MAJOR GROUPS*

	OUTPUT					SUPPORT					ALL GOALS
	STUDENT- EXPRESSIVE	STUDENT- INSTRUMENTAL	RESEARCH	DIRECT SERVICE	ALL OUTPUT	ADAPT- ATION	MANAGEMENT	MOTIVATION	POSITION	ALL SUPPORT	
Students	3.395 (3)	3.180	3.530 (1)	3.386 (4)	3.345	3.044	3.281	3.326 (5)	3.411 (2)	3.264	3.291
Faculty	3.639 (1)	3.117	3.635 (2)	3.491 (3)	3.441	3.186	3.340	3.306	3.477 (4)	3.323	3.363
Admin.	3.765 (1)	3.213	3.635 (2)	3.525 (4)	3.518	3.269	3.330	3.303	3.537 (3)	3.350	3.408
Boards	3.714 (1)	3.143	3.154	3.546 (2)	3.431	3.225	3.415 (4)	3.370	3.503 (3)	3.378	3.396
M.L.A.'s	3.653 (3)	3.700 (2)	3.400	3.260	3.521	3.348	3.418	3.159	3.733 (1)	3.405	3.446

*The figures represent the preferred mean on each category for each group. The figures in parentheses represent the rank of each category which displayed a mean greater than the mean for all goals for that group.

All groups place a greater value on output goals ("...those goals of the university which, immediately or in the future, are reflected in some product, service, skill or orientation which will affect society...") than on support goals (which "...reflect the need for the university as an organization to come to terms with the environment in which it is located: to attract students and staff, to finance the enterprise, to secure needed resources, and to validate the activities of the university with those persons or agencies in a

position to affect them..."). Since output goals are those goals which are usually thought of as the goals of an organization, this fact is not surprising.

There are two facts about the relative importance placed on the goal categories which are noteworthy. In the first place, none of the groups placed a much greater value on output goals than on support goals. This is certainly supportive of the argument by Gross and Grambsch (discussed in Chapter I) that 'support goals' are, indeed, goals of universities. They are very nearly deemed to be as important as output goals.

In the second place, the relative discrepancy between output and support goals was not expected, at least on the basis of stereotypical assessments. As suggested earlier, application of the professional organizational model to universities would likely classify administrators, members of Boards of Governors and Members of the Legislative Assembly as 'management' or 'administration' of the 'bureaucracy' which facilitates the work of the professionals. The results of the broad analysis of output and support goals make it difficult to accept any such contention. The discrepancy between the preferred means for output and support goals is 0.168 for administrators, 0.118 for faculty members, 0.116 for M.L.A.'s, 0.081 for students, and 0.053 for members of Boards of Governors. Administrators, M.L.A.'s and Board members thus rank first, third, and fifth, respectively.

A somewhat stronger argument may be made that the university is a professional organization if administrators are combined with faculty (who ranked second) as 'professionals', leaving the Board members and M.L.A.'s grouped under the heading of 'management' and the students (who ranked fourth) under the heading of 'client'. In addition to the empirical support provided for this categorization by the results of this study, it may be reasonable to expect that when the administrative component of a professional organization consists mainly of personnel drawn from the ranks of the professionals

in the organization, the preferences of the two groups will bear a substantial similarity to one another.

It was suggested earlier, on the basis of a similar argument posited by Etzioni, that the results of this thesis might indicate that "...the 'academic administrators' under study will generally value output goals less than teaching faculty." This has not been substantiated. In fact, both the actual output goal mean and the discrepancy score between the output goal mean and the support goal mean are greater for administrators than for faculty members. This evidence cannot be taken as conclusive, however, since there may be a vast difference between what members of these two groups say they prefer and what their actions and on-going decisions would indicate to an observer.

It was also suggested earlier that "...it may be expected that students will give lower priority to output goals than faculty and administration and higher priority to some support goals." The results bear this out. The discrepancies in means for faculty members and administrators are higher than the discrepancies in means for students, and the students do state a greater preference for some support goals, in terms of their relative emphasis on them.

Analysis of the values placed on the goal sub-categories by the five major groups also includes a number of results which do not correspond to the results one might expect on the basis of existing literature.

Student-Expressive goals (which "...involve the attempt to change the students' identity or character in some fundamental way ...") are seen as important by all groups.

Student-Instrumental goals (which "...involve the students' being equipped to do something specific for the society which he will be entering or to operate in a specific way in the society...") are only valued by M.L.A.'s. It might have been expected that Board members and students would also have displayed a preference for these goals. On the face of things, Board members would appear to have an

interest in a goal category which would likely be deemed to be important by the supporting public (a suggestion which is strengthened by the importance placed on Student-Instrumental goals by M.L.A.'s). These goals would also seem to be in the interest of students, since they have to do with those aspects of a student's life at university which will be most evident after he leaves, and since it is often argued that students attend university in order to prepare themselves for careers.

Probably the most unexpected results were found in the importance which students and faculty members placed on research. Research goals (which "...involve the production of new knowledge or the solution of problems...") include those activities which are often purported (in many cases by students), to be the only real interest of faculty members. It is striking that faculty members should place a greater value on goals related to student growth than on research goals, particularly when students rate research higher than any of the other goal sub-categories. It is not a total negation of Etzioni's argument that "...a majority of the members of their [universities] professional staff would see research as primary and teaching as secondary...", but neither is it supportive of this contention. It does suggest that the glib assumption that faculty members have considerably less interest in students than they do in research must be carefully examined.

Direct Service goals are goals which "...involve the direct and continuing provision of services to the population outside the university (that is, not faculty, full-time students, or staff). These services are provided because the university, as an organization, is better equipped than any other organization to provide them...". It is interesting to note that Board members place considerably more value on goals related to community service than do M.L.A.'s.

Adaptation goals (which "...reflect the need for the university as an organization to come to terms with the environment in which it is located: to attract students and staff, to finance the enterprise,

to secure needed resources, and to validate the activities of the university with those persons or agencies in a position to affect them..."), Management goals (which "...involve decisions on who should run the university, the need to handle conflict, and the establishment of priorities as to which output goals should be given maximum attention..."), and Motivation goals (which "...seek to ensure a high level of satisfaction on the part of staff and students and emphasize loyalty to the university as a whole..."), are 'preferred' less than the others in almost all cases. Given the vested interests which might be expected to play on goals related to the governance of the university, and the degree to which they are discussed on most campuses, it was expected that they would rank higher than they did.

On the face of it, the value placed on Position goals (which "...help to maintain the position of the university in terms of the kind of place it is compared with other universities and in the face of trends which could change its position...") by all groups is unexpected. However, an examination of the six individual goals within this category shows that four of the six goals relate to the quality of the 'programs' which the university offers, while the definition seems to connote defining the university according to various pressures. It is not surprising that respondents should underline the importance of the quality of programs.

On the basis of a row-ranking of all categories for each group in Table 4, students, faculty and administrators place a slightly greater emphasis on output goals than do Board members and M.L.A.'s. Other than the exceptions mentioned in the preceding paragraphs (particularly in Research and Direct Service goals), however, the most notable result seems to be the general agreement on the relative importance of the different types of goals. M.L.A.'s stray farthest from the pattern, but no firm conclusions can be made due to the small 'n' involved.

2. What are the different goals each group values?

Table 5 shows the average ratings for each goal for each group. The goals are listed in order of the combined preferred scores for all groups included in the study. The goals which have means greater than the combined mean of all goals for each group have their ranking indicated in parentheses.

The last column, headed 'Gross', indicates the rankings for the Gross-Grambsch study. No analysis of similarities and differences between the faculty members and administrators in the Gross-Grambsch study and this study will be carried out at this time. However, it is interesting to note the similarity between this group and others, particularly faculty members and administrators, on almost all goals.

While Table 5 indicates the ranking of all goals with means greater than the overall mean for each group, it seems reasonable to be somewhat more selective when talking about the individual goals which each group values. The operational definition of values will always be arbitrary, but the following discussion will examine those goals which rank in the top quartile (that is, goals which are ranked from 1 to 12).

When the data are analyzed in this way, the similarities between groups is seen again. Four goals fell in the top quartile for all groups.

- a) Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in. (Position)
- b) Keep up to date and responsive. (Position)
- c) Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically. (Student-Expressive)
- d) Make sure the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible. (Management)

Four additional goals fell in the top quartile of four of the five groups (in all cases, the exception was M.L.A.'s).

- a) Train students in methods of scholarship and for scientific

GROUP PREFERENCES IN INDIVIDUAL GOALS*

	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMIN.	BOARDS	M.L.A.'s	GROSS
Top Qual All (42)	4.049 (1)	4.098 (2)	4.112 (3)	3.962 (2)	4.200 (2)	4.14 (4)
Keep Up To Date (45)	4.033 (2)	4.023 (4)	4.106 (4)	4.077 (1)	4.000 (5)	4.09 (6)
Train Scholar. (8)	3.709 (6)	4.051 (3)	4.178 (1)	3.885 (5)	3.600 (18)	4.17 (2)
Stud Objectivity (4)	3.686 (8)	3.911 (6)	4.019 (6)	3.840 (7)	3.800 (10)	3.99 (8)
Well Round Stud (2)	3.732 (4)	3.669 (13)	3.657 (13)	3.960 (3)	4.000 (5)	3.75 (17)
Acad Freedom (35)	3.665 (9)	4.168 (1)	4.085 (5)	3.923 (4)	3.400	4.33 (1)
Ensure U Goals (33)	3.720 (5)	3.736 (11)	3.971 (7)	3.692 (11)	3.900 (7)	3.99 (9)
Stud Inquire (38)	3.931 (3)	3.770 (8)	3.857 (10)	3.885 (5)	3.400	3.88 (10)
Stud Intellect (1)	3.611 (12)	3.973 (5)	4.124 (2)	3.692 (11)	3.500 (20)	4.17 (3)
Top Qual Imp (43)	3.582 (13)	3.770 (8)	3.900 (9)	3.577 (20)	4.100 (3)	3.99 (7)
Just Rewd Inst (30)	3.477 (18)	3.607 (14)	3.792 (11)	3.815 (8)	3.900 (7)	3.77 (13)
Run U Demo (28)	3.704 (7)	3.577 (15)	3.381	3.692 (11)	3.700 (14)	3.61 (22)
App'd Research (12)	3.616 (11)	3.440 (20)	3.380	3.692 (11)	3.700 (14)	3.37
Keep Costs Down (23)	3.474 (19)	3.427 (21)	3.509 (21)	3.519 (24)	4.400 (1)	3.30
Pure Research (11)	3.523 (16)	3.768 (10)	3.787 (12)	3.308	3.400	3.76 (16)
Comm Cult Ldshp (15)	3.351 (23)	3.510 (17)	3.430 (24)	3.769 (9)	3.400	3.49
U Prestige (46)	3.394 (21)	3.561 (16)	3.635 (14)	3.654 (16)	3.300	3.80 (11)
Encour Grad Wk (32)	3.103	3.493 (19)	3.610 (15)	3.680 (15)	3.600 (18)	3.51
Dissem Ideas (16)	3.633 (10)	3.840 (7)	3.926 (8)	3.577 (20)	2.900	4.10 (5)
Stud Good Citzn (10)	3.288	3.403 (22)	3.571 (18)	3.542 (23)	3.800 (10)	3.76 (14)
Fac U Govt (26)	3.187	3.716 (12)	3.602 (16)	3.769 (9)	3.222	3.63 (19)
Stud Character (5)	3.312 (24)	3.324	3.426 (25)	3.583 (19)	3.800 (10)	3.79 (12)
Ensur Confidence (18)	3.063	3.327	3.549 (19)	3.615 (17)	3.700 (14)	3.52
Mntn Bal Quality (44)	3.507 (17)	3.313	3.298	3.615 (17)	3.500 (20)	3.36
Special Training (13)	3.209	3.255	3.452 (23)	3.480 (26)	3.778 (13)	3.18
Devlp Pride Univ (41)	3.538 (14)	3.499 (18)	3.481 (22)	3.000	3.400	3.59 (23)
Assist Citizens (14)	3.530 (15)	3.385 (23)	3.362	3.308	3.300	3.22
Stud Careers (6)	3.303 (25)	2.987	3.114	3.308	4.100 (3)	3.34
Devlp Fac Lylty (40)	2.975	3.047	3.355	3.462 (27)	3.900 (7)	3.47
Will of Fac (34)	3.101	3.293	3.402	3.407 (29)	3.333	3.56
Affect Stud Perm (3)	2.625	3.301	3.581 (17)	3.500 (25)	3.111	3.76 (15)
Preserv Heritage (17)	2.801	3.286	3.524 (20)	3.385	3.000	3.63 (20)
Undergrad Inst (31)	3.017	3.079	2.970	3.560 (22)	3.400	2.89
Stud Univ Govt (27)	3.392 (22)	2.929	2.850	3.423 (28)	3.300	2.69
Sat Area Needs (22)	3.256	3.025	3.131	3.000	3.200	3.00
Educ to Utmost (20)	3.044	3.165	3.241	3.185	3.200	3.19
Keep Harmony (29)	3.080	2.950	2.861	2.923	3.400	3.06
Stud Activities (37)	3.401 (20)	2.939	2.703	3.320	3.000	2.99
Hold Our Staff (24)	2.990	3.149	3.189	3.240	3.000	3.74 (18)
Mntn Fav Apprsl (19)	2.854	3.319	3.250	2.692	3.111	3.31
Max Opprtunity (36)	2.636	2.289	2.330	2.308	3.700 (14)	3.55
Stud Taste (9)	3.031	3.120	3.010	2.769	2.000	2.78
Stud Success (7)	2.959	2.808	2.854	2.667	3.300	3.31
Reward Prof (25)	2.967	2.929	3.000	2.875	2.900	3.63 (21)
Stud Pol Rights (39)	3.060	2.814	2.608	2.778	2.700	3.08
Good Stud Only (21)	2.376	2.910	2.850	2.577	2.600	3.09
Pres Character (47)	2.166	2.092	2.140	2.115	3.000	2.13

*The figures represent the mean score on each goal for each group. The figures in parentheses represent the rank ordering of the goals with a mean greater than the mean for all goals for each group. Goals are listed in preference order for all groups combined.

research and/or creative endeavor. (Student-Instrumental)

- b) Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.
(Motivation)
- c) Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in. (Motivation)
- d) Produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum. (Student-Expressive)

Three goals fell in the top quartile of three of the five groups. No pattern was evident in the groups which valued these goals.

- a) Produce a well-rounded student, that is, one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual, and esthetic potentialities have all been cultivated. (Student-Expressive - valued by students, Board Members, and M.L.A.'s.)
- b) Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards). (Position - valued by faculty members, administrators, and M.L.A.'s.)
- c) Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this university. (Management - valued by administrators, Board Members, and M.L.A.'s.)

Neither the specific goals nor the sub-categories which they represent display any identifiable pattern. The goals are almost exactly divided between the Output and Support goal categories.

3. How much divergence or consensus is there regarding each of these goals?

The goals were ranked for each group on the basis of their mean preferred scores. Rank order correlations were calculated for pairs of the groups and sub-groups.

Table 6 presents the rank order correlations between the four groups at the University of Alberta and the M.L.A.'s, the four groups at The University of Calgary and the M.L.A.'s, the four groups at the University of Lethbridge and the M.L.A.'s, and the four groups at all three universities and the M.L.A.'s.

Patterns are difficult to discern. While the 'full-time' members of the university (that is, students, faculty, and administrators) have the greatest overall agreement in the ranking of the goals at the University of Alberta and The University of Calgary, the Board members at the University of Lethbridge weaken this pattern.

The most consistent agreement between groups also represents the greatest agreement in the order of goal preference between groups. Faculty members and administrators consistently had the largest correlation. As was suggested earlier, this is very likely due to the fact that academic administrators are drawn from the ranks of faculty members.

Faculty members have a consistently high correlation with students, administrators, and Board members, but it is as consistently low with M.L.A.'s. The latter, on the other hand, have a consistently low correlation with all other groups. While it might have been expected that the 'public' nature of the M.L.A.'s and the quasi-public nature of the Boards of Governors would result in a high correlation between these groups, the opposite appears to be the case. (This could relate to the higher level of education of the members of Boards of Governors.)

If any general pattern exists, it is that students, faculty members, administrators and Board members are in very general agreement as to the importance which universities ought to place on their goals, while M.L.A.'s display very little agreement with these four groups. (Once, again, the very poor response rate of M.L.A.'s to the survey makes it difficult to draw firm conclusions in this regard. However, the consistently low correlation between M.L.A.'s

and other groups suggests that such a pattern might have prevailed if a greater response rate had been achieved.)

TABLE 6
SIMILARITY IN PREFERRED GOALS*

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS.	BOARD	M.L.A.'s
STUDENTS	1.0000	2	3	8	6
FACULTY	.7496	1.0000	1	5	10
ADMINS.	.6901	.9382	1.0000	4	7
BOARD	.4878	.5655	.5804	1.0000	9
M.L.A.'s	.5464	.4462	.4986	.4869	1.0000
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS.	BOARD	M.L.A.'s
STUDENTS	1.0000	2	4	6	7
FACULTY	.8480	1.0000	1	3	8
ADMINS.	.6571	.8628	1.0000	5	10
BOARD	.5813	.6811	.6314	1.0000	9
M.L.A.'s	.5169	.4781	.4178	.4577	1.0000
UNIVERSITY OF LETH.	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS.	BOARD	M.L.A.'s
STUDENTS	1.0000	5	6	4	7
FACULTY	.6666	1.0000	1	2	10
ADMINS.	.6374	.8917	1.0000	3	9
BOARD	.7452	.8264	.8237	1.0000	8
M.L.A.'s	.5723	.2724	.4071	.5102	1.0000
ALL UNIVERSITIES	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS.	BOARD	M.L.A.'s
STUDENTS	1.0000	3	6	5	8
FACULTY	.8134	1.0000	1	2	10
ADMINS.	.7040	.9472	1.0000	4	9
BOARD	.7653	.8354	.8082	1.0000	7
M.L.A.'s	.5392	.4644	.4856	.5799	1.0000

*The figures in the lower left of the table represent the rank order correlations of the ranked means of each goal for each group. The figures in the upper right of the table represent the rank of these correlations.

In order to examine differences in preferred goals, the contingency tables in Table 7 were generated. The goals were ranked in order of their mean preferred scores for each of the five groups.

TABLE 7

DIFFERENCES IN PREFERRED GOALS*

ALFACLTY					ALADMINS				
ALSTUDNT	1	2	3	4	ALSTUDNT	1	2	3	4
1	9	3	0	0	1	9	1	2	0
2	2	6	2	2	2	3	4	3	2
3	1	3	4	4	3	0	5	4	3
4	0	0	6	5	4	0	2	3	6

ALBOARDS					MLAS				
ALSTUDNT	1	2	3	4	ALSTUDNT	1	2	3	4
1	11	1	0	0	1	5	6	0	1
2	2	5	4	1	2	4	4	3	1
3	1	3	4	4	3	2	4	4	2
4	0	1	4	6	4	1	2	1	7

ALADMINS					ALBOARD				
ALFACLTY	1	2	3	4	ALFACLTY	1	2	3	4
1	11	1	0	0	1	9	2	1	0
2	1	8	3	0	2	5	5	1	1
3	0	3	7	2	3	0	3	7	2
4	0	0	2	9	4	0	0	3	8

MLAS					ALBOARD				
ALFACLTY	1	2	3	4	ALADMINS	1	2	3	4
1	5	5	1	1	1	9	2	1	0
2	4	6	2	0	2	3	5	3	1
3	2	3	2	5	3	2	2	6	2
4	1	2	3	5	4	0	1	2	8

MLAS					MLAS				
ALADMINS	1	2	3	4	ALBOARDS	1	2	3	4
1	6	5	0	1	1	6	7	1	0
2	3	5	2	2	2	4	4	1	1
3	3	3	4	2	3	2	2	4	4
4	0	3	2	6	4	0	3	2	6

*The means for each goal for each group were ranked and divided into quartiles. Differences are represented by goals which fall in the three lower-left or upper-right cells.

They were then divided into quartiles, with the first twelve goals being placed in the first quartile, the second twelve being placed in the second quartile, the third twelve being placed in the third quartile, and the last eleven goals being placed in the fourth quartile. Each goal was then given a score of from one to four, depending on the quartile in which it was found. Cross-tabulations of these scores were then carried out between pairs of groups.

The figures in the diagonal cells running from top left to bottom right represent goals which were placed in the same quartile by both groups. The figures in the cells adjacent to the diagonals represent goals whose quartile placement varied by one between the two groups. It was arbitrarily predetermined that the importance of these goals should be considered as agreed upon by the two groups.

The figures in the top right-hand cell and the bottom left-hand cell represent a difference of three quartiles in the placement of goals (that is, the greatest possible disparity, using this technique.) The figures in the cells contiguous to these represent a disparity of two quartiles in the placement of goals. It was arbitrarily predetermined that differences exist regarding the importance of these goals from the view-point of members of the two groups.

On the basis of the criteria suggested above, 89.6% of the goals included in the ten contingency tables in Table 7 are agreed upon by pairs of groups. While differences exist regarding 10.4% of the goals (49 out of 470), these represented 17 of the 47 actual goals. Of these, 9 are goals which were placed in the top quartile by at least one of the groups. (Table 5)

Table 8 represents the nine preferred goals for which differences exist. Seventeen of the cells include M.L.A.'s, 12 of the cells include Board members, 8 of the cells include administrators, 8 of the cells include faculty members, and 7 of the cells include students.

Once again, the divergence in goal preference between M.L.A.'s and other groups is great. While Board members also diverge from

students, faculty, and administrators, they do not do so in the same direction as M.L.A.'s. The students, faculty, and administrators appear to be in general agreement with one another. In fact, when their differences with Board members and M.L.A.'s are deleted, they are shown to be in disagreement on the emphasis which should be placed on only two goals.

TABLE 8

DIVERGENCE IN EMPHASIZED GOALS*

	S/F	S/A	S/B	S/M	F/A	F/B	F/M	A/B	A/M	B/M
DISSEM IDEAS				1/4			1/4		1/4	2/4
STUD CAREERS				3/1			4/1		3/1	3/1
APPLIED RESEARCH			2/4			2/4		2/4		4/2
FAC U GOVT	3/1		3/1				1/3			1/3
DEVL P FAC LYLTY							3/1		3/1	3/1
STUD CHARACTER							3/1		3/1	
PURE RESEARCH						1/3		1/3		
RUN U DEMO		1/3						3/1		
STUD. GOOD CITZN				3/1						

*The nine goals were each placed in the top quartile of the preferred goals by at least one group. They are ranked in order of the degree of conflict indicated over all groups. The figures in the cells represent the quartiles each goal was placed in by the relevant groups.

In a discussion of divergence and consensus in goal preference between groups, as well as in other sections of this study, it is reasonable to ask whether or not the groups are relatively homogeneous. While the answer to this question will have limited impact on this particular study, it will have implications regarding further inquiry in this area.

Due to the paucity of documentation regarding the homogeneity or heterogeneity of university students, it was decided that this group would be analyzed on the bases of faculty and of successfully

completed years at university. Due to the small numbers of respondents in many faculties, and due to the generally assumed differences in the nature of the students, it was determined that the correlation of goal preferences would be carried out on students in the Faculties of Arts, Education, Engineering and Science.

TABLE 9

STUDENT PREFERENCE CORRELATIONS BY FACULTY*

	ARTS	EDUCATION	ENGINEERING	SCIENCE
ARTS	1.0000			
EDUCATION	.9541	1.0000		
ENGINEERING	.8419	.8831	1.0000	
SCIENCE	.9514	.9664	.9135	1.0000

*The figures in the table represent the rank order correlations of the preferred means of each goal for students in each faculty.

The correlations between faculties appear high enough to assume that students are homogeneous on this variable.

The results are considerably different when students are analyzed on the basis of successfully completed years at university. The bottom row of Table 10 shows the gradual socialization of the undergraduate student toward the goal preferences of faculty members. The left-hand column shows the same thing in a different way --- the gradual reduction of the correlation between first year students and other students as the numbers of years between them increases. (In both cases, this relationship exists only for students with five or fewer successfully completed years at university.)

Students do differ, on at least this variable, in their goal preferences. Since it is likely that they differ on others, and that other groups do so as well, generalizations about 'students' and others must, as always, be made with caution.

TABLE 10
STUDENT PREFERENCE CORRELATIONS BY YEAR*

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	FAC.
0	1.0000								
1	.7762	1.0000							
2	.6993	.9021	1.0000						
3	.5359	.5079	.6830	1.0000					
4	.3217	.3986	.3427	.3748	1.0000				
5	.2867	.2168	.3986	.4659	.6154	1.0000			
6	.4238	.6550	.6060	.3474	.5884	.4238	1.0000		
7	.3333	.5860	.5333	.3076	.4246	.3018	.4183	1.0000	
FAC.	-.0909	.1049	.2587	.3503	.4755	.7273	.6200	.2877	1.0000

*The figures in the table represent the rank order correlations of the preferred means of each goal for students having successfully completed the indicated number of years. Faculty members are included for comparison.

4. What degree of consensus is there between goal perceptions?

The goals were ranked for each group on the basis of their mean perceived scores. Rank order correlations were calculated for pairs of the groups and sub-groups.

Table 11 presents the rank order correlations between the four groups at the University of Alberta and the M.L.A.'s, the four groups at The University of Calgary and the M.L.A.'s, and the four groups at the University of Lethbridge and the M.L.A.'s.

Little can be said about the congruence or lack of it between goal perceptions. Few of the correlations are high, particularly given that the groups at each university are describing the present emphasis on the goals of the university. The one pattern which seems to exist is that the three on-campus groups have a high correlation with each other and, in many cases, with Board members. Agreement between these groups and M.L.A.'s on the present emphasis placed on goals is generally very low. This must be explained, at least in part, by the fact that the M.L.A.'s are attempting to describe a

composite picture of the present situation at all three universities.

TABLE 11

SIMILARITIES IN GOAL PERCEPTIONS*

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS.	BOARD	M.L.A.'s
STUDENTS	1.0000	4	6	5	10
FACULTY	.7694	1.0000	1	2	9
ADMINS.	.6666	.8975	1.0000	3	8
BOARD	.7301	.8464	.7909	1.0000	7
M.L.A.'s	.4434	.5368	.5676	.5945	1.0000
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS.	BOARD	M.L.A.'s
STUDENTS	1.0000	2	4	8	9
FACULTY	.7090	1.0000	1	6	3
ADMINS.	.6137	.7503	1.0000	7	5
BOARD	.4976	.5834	.5294	1.0000	10
M.L.A.'s	.4156	.6475	.5942	.3076	1.0000
UNIVERSITY OF LETH.	STUDENTS	FACULTY	ADMINS.	BOARD	M.L.A.'s
STUDENTS	1.0000	4	5	7	6
FACULTY	.7125	1.0000	2	1	9
ADMINS.	.6116	.7566	1.0000	3	8
BOARD	.5409	.7630	.7354	1.0000	10
M.L.A.'s	.5945	.3032	.4139	.1451	1.0000

*The figures in the lower left of the table represent the rank order correlations of the ranked means of each goal for each group. The figures in the upper right of the table represent the rank of these correlations.

5. What is the relationship between goal perceptions and goal preferences?

Assessing the relationship between goal perceptions and goal preferences is most meaningfully carried out at the individual university level, since the perceptions of all groups except M.L.A.'s relate directly to their own campuses. It is done so herein, but it

is also carried out for the combined groups from all three universities.

Two procedures were followed. In the first, rank order correlations between the perceived goals and the preferred goals were calculated for each group and sub-group. Table 12 shows the resulting correlations.

TABLE 12

PERCEIVED - PREFERRED GOAL CORRELATIONS*

	U of ALBERTA	U of CALGARY	U of LETHBRIDGE	ALL	M.L.A.'s
STUDENTS	.1810	.2080	.4653	.2112	
FACULTY	.3748	.4885	.6437	.4429	
ADMINISTRATION	.4668	.4894	.6757	.5079	
BOARD	.0752	.5876	.6921	.5686	
M.L.A.'s					.1638

*The figures in the table represent the rank order correlations between the perceived means and the preferred means for all goals for each group and sub-group.

There are three important observations to be made regarding the data in Table 12. First, none of the correlations are high, and a few are very low. Generally speaking, then, there are some distinct differences between the goal perceptions and goal preferences of most groups.

In the second place, there is a pattern in the columns which holds true in all cases except the Board of Governors at the University of Alberta. The greatest divergence between perceived and preferred goals exists for students. The greatest convergence exists for Board members, followed by administrators and then faculty members.

Finally, there is a pattern in the rows which holds for all three universities. That is, the larger the institution, the smaller the correlation for each group.

The second procedure followed in order to examine the relationship between goal perceptions and goal preferences involved rank ordering the perceived means and the preferred means for each group, dividing these into quartiles, and then generating contingency tables. The goals which fell in the diagonal cells running from top left to bottom right were goals which were ranked in the same perception and preference quartile. The goals which fell in the cells adjacent to the diagonals were goals whose placement varied by one perception and preference quartile. The goals in the other six cells varied by two or three quartile places, and it was arbitrarily predetermined that divergence exists in the perceived and preferred importance of these goals.

Table 13 is a summary of the goals for which more than one group indicated a divergence between the current importance placed on the goal and the importance which ought to be placed on it. A cell with an '0' in it indicates that a group feels that greater importance ought to be placed on a goal. A cell with an 'X' in it indicates that a group feels that less importance ought to be placed on a goal.

The first twelve goals in Table 13 were generally seen as having either sufficient or too little importance placed on them. Nine of these twelve goals are 'output' goals. The last seventeen goals were generally seen as having either sufficient or too great importance placed on them. Fifteen of these seventeen goals are 'support' goals. While Gross has made a very convincing argument for making 'ends' of 'means', it is clear that the respondents to this survey believe that many output goals of Alberta universities require greater emphasis than they currently receive, while many support goals require less.

Goals numbered (1) through (5) are Student-Expressive goals. Since these are all included in the first twelve goals, it is apparent that many groups feel that more importance needs to be placed on goals which "...involve the attempt to change the students'

identity or character in some fundamental way."

TABLE 13
PERCEIVED - PREFERRED GOAL DIVERGENCE*

	U A S	U A F	U A A	U A B	U C S	U C F	U C A	U C B	U L S	U L F	U L A	U L B	A L S	A L F	A L A	A L B	M L A
WELL ROUND STUD (2)	0		0	0	0			0	0	0			0		0		0
STUD OBJECTIVITY (4)	0	0	0		0	0		0					0	0	0		0
STUD CHARACTER (5)	0		0						0		0	0	0			0	0
STUD INQUIRE (38)	0	0		0	0	0		0					0	0			
JUST REWD INST (30)				0		0	0	0			0					0	0
ASSIST CITIZENS (14)	0				0	0			0				0	0			
STUD INTELLECT (1)		0			0	0							0	0			
DEVL P PRIDE UNIV (41)					0		0	0	0						0		
STUD GOOD CITZN (10)		0				0		0						0			0
SPECIAL TRAINING (13)									0		0					0	
AFFECT STUD PERM (3)		0		0													X
DISSEM IDEAS (16)	0			X	0		0	0	0			0					X
UNDERGRAD INST (31)				0		X	X	X									0
STUD ACTIVITIES (37)		X		X				X	0							X	
STUD CAREERS (6)		X	X		X								X	X			0
ENSUR CONFIDENCE (18)	X			0	X			X		X			X				
STUD UNIV GOVT (27)		X	X		0					X	X			X	X	X	
PRES CHARACTER (47)	X			X													
RUN U DEMO (28)							X								X		
KEEP HARMONY (29)								X								X	
U PRESTIGE (46)	X				X								X				
FAC U GOVT (26)	X						X		X				X				
MNTN FAV APPRSL (19)	X			X	X	X							X				
EDUC TO UTMOST (20)		X		X		X	X							X			X
HOLD OUR STAFF (24)	X		X	X	X								X			X	X
MAX OPPRTUNITY (36)	X			X	X				X		X	X				X	
STUD SUCCESS (7)	X	X	X		X	X			X				X	X			
WILL OF FAC (34)	X			X	X		X		X			X	X		X	X	X
ENCOUR GRAD WK (32)	X	X	X	X		X	X						X	X	X		X

*Each '0' indicates a group which feels that greater emphasis ought to be placed on a goal than is currently the case. Each 'X' indicates a group which feels that less emphasis ought to be placed on a goal. The headings for the first twelve columns represent the sub-groups from each university (for example, 'UAS' represents University of Alberta Students), while the headings in the last five columns represent the groups from all universities, and the Members of the Legislative Assembly (for example, 'ALF' represents All Faculty Members).

Seven of the goals are seen by some sub-groups as **over-emphasized** and other sub-groups as under-emphasized. However, only two goals exhibited this dichotomy within one university:

- 16. Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics; and
- 18. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.

While all of the goals listed in Table 13 indicate a difference in priorities at one or more universities, the above two goals display a more serious difference in viewpoints and therefore require more attention from members of the university involved.

On the other hand, there are a number of goals which display considerable agreement between groups on the need to increase or decrease the emphasis placed on them. In addition to the goals displaying considerable inter-group agreement in Table 13, eighteen of the original goals were not included in the list because the groups involved felt they were currently receiving an appropriate degree of attention. (One might expect these eighteen goals to be goals considered to be of little importance. In fact, they included the goals which ranked first, second, third, sixth, seventh and tenth in the preferences of all groups combined.) (Table 5)

The University of Alberta and The University of Calgary each have twenty-five goals indicating some form of goal divergence, while the University of Lethbridge has fourteen such goals.

The students are the group most often in disagreement with other groups as to the divergence between goal perceptions and goal preferences. The two groups most often in disagreement with one another are the students and the faculty members. The two groups most often in agreement with one another are the faculty members and the administrators.

Summary and Discussion

One very important variable in a discussion of the goals of Alberta universities is the nature of the universities. This variable will have an effect on the responses from groups within a university and on the inter-university analyses. (Only a few very limited generalizations are made in this study, since the total population consists of only three universities.)

One important characteristic of the three Alberta universities is the variation in their sizes. At the time the questionnaire was administered (February and March, 1971), there were approximately 18,360 students at the University of Alberta, 9,300 students at The University of Calgary, and 1,420 students at the University of Lethbridge. It has been demonstrated throughout Chapter III that the smaller University (Lethbridge) displays the greatest convergence in goal preferences and the larger University (Alberta) displays the greatest divergence. (It could be argued that the age of the universities, which varies in the same way as size, is related to this goal convergence and divergence. It may be, but it seems more likely to be size. This is due to the relative propinquity of Alberta and Calgary on both the size variable and preferred goal divergence, while the age variable would have Calgary and Lethbridge grouped together.)

An examination of Table 6 and Table 11 shows that the inter-group correlations of perceived goal priorities at the University of Alberta are greater than the preferred goal priorities, while at both The University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge the inter-group correlations of goal preferences are greater than the inter-group correlations of goal perceptions. It may be that this result relates to the relative ages of the universities, since the University of Alberta's longer history could mean that actual goal priorities are more firmly established and more readily perceived. Whatever the reason for the difference, the potential for achieving consensus regarding change appears to be greater in the two universities wherein

the groups' preferences are more convergent than their perceptions of current emphases.

On the basis of the types of analyses carried out in this study, the question of whether the university has graduate students or not seems to have little bearing on the goal preferences or perceived-preferred goal divergence. The same was true when an attempt was made to determine whether the universities could be divided on the basis of a cosmopolitan versus local orientation. As suggested earlier, the restriction of only having a population of three makes the delineating of patterns extremely difficult.

Within the universities, however, and among similar groups at the three universities, the pattern which most often emerges groups the faculty and administrators together. (In many cases, these two groups are found to be in general agreement with students, as well.) If this pattern were to be diagrammed, it would consist of a series of five concentric circles, with faculty members in the center, then administrators, students, Board members and M.L.A.'s. Without making any assumptions concerning the group or groups which have the greatest impact on university goal-setting, it seems fair to say that the variable which underlies the agreement between groups on their goal perceptions and preferences appears to be the amount of contact which each group has with the 'professionals' in the university, the faculty members.

At one point in this Chapter, support was offered for the argument of Gross and Grambsch that support activities are goals of the university. At another point, this was brought into question. Generally speaking, the results of this study are supportive of their argument.

One of the more unexpected results of the analysis was the high value placed on goals which involve the attempt to change the students' identity or character in some fundamental way (Student-Expressive goals). Given what appears to be the misleading stereotype of the apathetic and grade-conscious student, it is noteworthy that the

students at all three universities should wish to have greater importance placed on such goals as producing a well-rounded students.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

Practical limitations made it impossible to introduce one very important variable to this study of goal perceptions and preferences. It was impossible to measure what each group is actually doing. Measurement of activities and of such things as time and resource commitment would make it possible to assess the validity of the stated perceptions and preferences. The importance of the introduction of this variable to the analysis is underlined by the divergence between the groups in their perceptions of what is actually taking place in their universities at the present time.

It seems reasonable to conclude that the faculty members and administrators from American universities who responded to the Gross-Grampsch study are very similar in their preferences to the faculty members and administrators included in this study. The only marked difference is that the American respondents placed considerably greater emphasis on developing "...the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices." Some small degree of support is therefore offered for the applicability of American studies in this area to Alberta universities.

One of the overriding questions which this study has attempted to examine is whether or not there are "...fundamental differences in goal perceptions and preferences between the universities clients (students), professionals (teaching faculty members), and administrators (administrators, Boards of Governors, and Members of the Legislative Assembly)..." The only 'fundamental' difference which seems to exist is that the Members of the Legislative Assembly who responded to the questionnaire are at considerable variance with the other groups as to the types of goals they would emphasize, the individual goals they would emphasize, and their perception of what is presently emphasized.

While the greatest degree of goal divergence exists between

M.L.A.'s and the other groups, the greatest degree of goal convergence exists between faculty members and administrators. It has long been assumed by many members of university groups that faculty members are concerned with the 'teaching-learning' process, while administrators are concerned with efficient management. The results of this study support the contention of Gross and Grambsch that this assumption is incorrect.

Little evidence is offered by the results of this study in support of the contention that the professional organization model may readily be applied to the university. The literature cited in Chapter I suggests that management consists of administrators, Board members and M.L.A.'s. The results of this study suggest that administrators do not fall within the stereotypical picture of management within organizations. Does management, then, consist of Board members and M.L.A.'s? The differences between M.L.A.'s and Board members make it difficult to group them together in this way. (The best illustration of this may be found in the goal 'keep costs down'. M.L.A.'s rank this goal first in importance, while Board members are remarkably similar to the other three groups with a ranking of twenty-fourth.) Perhaps the higher level of education of Board members and their proximity to the university create this difference between them and M.L.A.'s.

This study was designed to "...determine the basis for some similarities and differences in the goal perceptions and preferences of people in positions which may have an impact on their organization's goals...". It was posited that examining universities as organizations would broaden the base of knowledge about universities, since previous studies had examined them as institutions or communities (both of which lay insufficient stress on the importance of goal attainment to universities). While it still seems reasonable to study universities in terms of their goals, this study offers little support for using the professional organization model (nor any other

existing model, for that matter), as a basis from which to examine universities.

A final conclusion is that a large number of assumptions about the attitudes and positions of university groups have been challenged by the results of this study. Further study in the area may destroy some of them.

Implications

As indicated earlier, considerable divergence exists between the various groups under study in their descriptions of the present emphasis placed on goals. Two implications for further study arise from this. One is that respondents' descriptions of existing goal profiles ought to be validated by an assessment of the resources which are actually utilized by an organization to achieve its goals. The second is that an analysis could be undertaken to determine the relationship between perceptions of the goals of the organization, perceptions of the goal preferences of other groups, and perceptions of the power position of the groups involved. It might also be fruitful to attempt to explore the impact of goal preferences on goal perceptions. It may be that the perception of the present emphasis on a goal is affected by a respondent's preference concerning its' importance.

The applicability of the professional organization model for studying universities has been brought into question by the results of this study. Further inquiry is required, however, before a firm conclusion may be reached in this regard. In addition to attempting to confirm or reject these results, such study could attempt to develop a model which does correspond to the university in reality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blau, Peter M., and W. Richard Scott. "Dilemmas of Formal Organizations", in Etzioni, Amitai, (ed.), Readings on Modern Organizations, Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey, 1969.
- Corson John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1960.
- Davis, Keith. Human Relations at Work, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1962.
- Deutsch, Morton. "The Effects of Cooperation and Competition upon Group Processes", in Buckley, Walter. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1967.
- Duster, Troy. "Student Interests, Student Power, and Swedish Experience". The American Behavioral Scientists, May-June, 1968, pp. 21-27.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1964.
- Gross, Edward. "The Definition of Organizational Goals", British Journal of Sociology, 20:3, September, 1968, pp. 277-294.
- Gross, Edward. "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach", American Sociological Review, 33:518-44, August, 1968.
- Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul V. University Goals and Academic Power, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968.
- Jervis, Frederick M., and Congdon, Robert G. "Student and Faculty Perceptions of Educational Values", American Psychologist, Vol. 13, 1958, pp. 464-466.
- Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.
- Moe, Edward O. "Utah Community Development Program", in Warner, W. Keith and A. Eugene Havens. "Goal Displacement and the Intangibility of Organizational Goals", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12, 1967-68, pp. 540-555.
- Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1960.

Parsons, Talcott, Ed. Theories of Society, Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1961.

Porter, John. "The Democratisation of the Canadian Universities and the Need for a National System", *Minerva*, February, 1970, pp. 325-356.

Thiessen, Victor, and Iutovich, Mark. "Some Comments on Edward Gross's Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach", The American Sociologist. Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 252-254, August, 1970.

Thompson, James D., and McEwan, William J. "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal-Setting as an Interaction Process", American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, No. 1, February, 1958.

Warner, W. Keith, and Havens, A. Eugene. "Goal Displacement and the Intangibility of Organizational Goals", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12, 1967-68, pp. 540-555.

APPENDIX

GOAL PERCEPTIONS AND PREFERENCES IN UNIVERSITIES

This questionnaire is being given to all presidents, vice-presidents, deans, directors, department chairmen and members of the Board of Governors at the three Alberta universities, and to all members of the Alberta Legislature. It is also being given to a carefully selected random sample of the teaching faculty and the students at each university. The results will provide us with a comprehensive picture of the goal priorities of groups within and directly related to our universities. In spite of the large numbers involved, the success of the study depends entirely on the kindness and generosity of each respondent. The results may be of interest or value to you, and they will be distributed as widely as possible.

This questionnaire is **COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL**. No one will see it except the professional members of our staff. Nevertheless, for purposes of control of returns and financial savings on follow-up letters for non-respondents, we would ask that you consider placing your name in the space below. This is **NOT** mandatory, and your response will be just as valuable to our analysis if you do not choose to place your name on the questionnaire.

THE GOALS OF YOUR UNIVERSITY

One of the growing issues in Canadian education has to do with the proper aims or goals of the university. The question is: What are we trying to accomplish? On the following pages, we have listed a large number of the more commonly claimed aims, intentions or goals of a university. We would like you to react to each of these in two different ways:

- (1) How important IS each aim at your University?
- (2) How important SHOULD the aim be at your University?

EXAMPLE

Goal	of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say
IS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
to serve as substitute parents						
SHOULD					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A person who checked the alternatives in the manner shown above would be expressing his perception that the aim, intention or goal, "to serve as substitute parents," IS of medium importance at his university but that he believes it SHOULD BE of no importance as an aim, intention, or goal of his university.

NOTE: "of absolutely top importance" should only be checked if the aim is so important that, if it were to be removed, the university would be shaken to its very roots and its character changed in a fundamental way.

PLEASE: look quickly over all of the goals before you begin to respond.

ABOUT YOURSELF

FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY

1. Many people play more than one role within or around a university. What we would like you to do is place a check in the box beside the one position which describes the major role which you play.

- ☐ full-time student
- ☐ teaching faculty member
- ☐ member of a Board of Governors
- ☐ member of the Alberta Legislature
- ☐ Department Head
- ☐ Director of School or Dean
- ☐ administrator (President, Vice-President, Registrars)
- ☐ other (please describe): _____

2. Present age (nearest birthday): (check one):

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> under 18 | <input type="checkbox"/> 18-20 | <input type="checkbox"/> 21-25 | <input type="checkbox"/> 26-30 | <input type="checkbox"/> 31-35 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 36-40 | <input type="checkbox"/> 41-45 | <input type="checkbox"/> 46-50 | <input type="checkbox"/> 51-60 | <input type="checkbox"/> 61 or over |

3. Sex: (check one) ☐ Male
☐ Female

4. Marital Status: (check one)

- ☐ Single
- ☐ Married
- ☐ Divorced, and presently unmarried
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Widowed

5. Your Education

- ☐ 11 years or less
- ☐ 12 years
- ☐ some years of college or university, but no degree received
- ☐ Bachelor's degree
- ☐ some years in graduate studies, but no graduate degree received
- ☐ Master's degree
- ☐ M.D.
- ☐ Ph.D.
- ☐ other (please elaborate): _____

6

7-8

9

10

11

6. All respondents to this questionnaire are either connected to one of the Alberta universities or, as is the case with members of the Legislature, to all three. Please check the alternative which best describes your position.

- ☐ University of Alberta
☐ University of Calgary
☐ University of Lethbridge
☐ all three universities

7. This question is FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHING FACULTY MEMBERS ONLY. The following is a list of all faculties and schools. Please check the one to which you belong. (Arts and Sciences have been divided, as they are at the University of Alberta. If you are a member of an Arts and Science Faculty at the University of Calgary or the University of Lethbridge, please check the one which best describes your affiliation. If you cannot decide between the two, please check them both.) All graduate students should check the Faculty or School which contains their discipline.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Law |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Arts | <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Medicine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Business | <input type="checkbox"/> School of Nursing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School of Dental Hygiene | <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Pharmacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Dentistry | <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty (School) of Physical Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Education | <input type="checkbox"/> School of Rehabilitation Medicine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Engineering | <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty of Science |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School of Library Science | <input type="checkbox"/> School of Social Welfare |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School of Household Economics | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): _____ | |

8. This question is FOR TEACHING FACULTY MEMBERS ONLY. Which of the following academic positions best describes your appointment?

- ☐ Sessional Lecturer
☐ Assistant Professor
☐ Associate Professor
☐ Full Professor
☐ Other (please elaborate): _____

9. This question is FOR STUDENTS ONLY.

(a) As accurately as possible, describe the occupation of the parent who is or was the major wage-earner in your family. _____

(b) Which one of the following best describes the occupation of the parent who is or was the major wage-earner in your family?

- ☐ Professional, Technical and Managerial
- ☐ Clerical and Sales (sales clerks, office workers, book-keepers, etc.)
- ☐ Service (waiters, chefs, hair-dressing, recreation, etc.)
- ☐ Farming, Fishing, Forestry and related
- ☐ Processing (metals, foods, etc.)
- ☐ Machine Trades
- ☐ Bench Work (assembly lines, repairs, etc.)
- ☐ Structural Work (welders, carpenters, etc.)
- ☐ Other (please describe): _____

10. This question is FOR STUDENTS ONLY. How many years of university education (or its equivalent) have you successfully completed?

66/2

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 years | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 years | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 or more years |

11. This question is FOR STUDENTS ONLY. Which of the following categories best describes your present status?

67/2

- ☐ Undergraduate student
- ☐ Graduate student

12. This question is FOR MEMBERS OF BOARDS OF GOVERNORS AND M.L.A.'s ONLY. Which of the following best describes your occupation?

68/2

- ☐ Professional, Technical and Managerial
- ☐ Clerical and Sales (sales clerks, office workers, book-keepers, etc.)
- ☐ Service (waiters, chefs, hair-dressing, recreation, etc.)
- ☐ Farming, Fishing, Forestry and related
- ☐ Processing (metals, foods, etc.)
- ☐ Machine Trades
- ☐ Bench Work (assembly lines, repairs, etc.)
- ☐ Structural Work (welders, carpenters, etc.)
- ☐ Other (please describe): _____

[illegible]

develop greater pride on the part of faculty, staff and students in their university and the things it stands for

[illegible]

[illegible]

of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say
---------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------

[illegible]

B30000